

TRANSLATION OF THE OFFICIAL LETTER

Drafting Date: April 21, 2008

Dispatch Date: April 24, 2008

The present application should be rejected for the reasons stated in the previous official letter.

Although the written argument and written amendment were examined, no reason sufficient to alter the previous official action has been found.

(Examiner's Notes:)

Concerning Claims 1 - 16, 18 and 19:

A matrix-type LED device, where a reflection frame is made of white resin, a LED is disposed within the reflection frame and the inside of the reflection frame is sealed with transparent resin, belongs to a known art and exhibits no novel operation/working-effect (see References 1 - 3).

Thus, a person skilled in the art can easily use Citations 1 - 5 in the previous official letter and the white-resin reflector in the known art to realize Claims 1 - 16, 18 and 19.

(References:)

- (1) JP Pat. Appln. Discl. No. 2001-237462 - Aug. 31, 2001
Patent Application No. 2000-44813 - Feb. 22, 2000
Priority: None
Applicant: Sanyo Denki K.K., Osaka, Japan
Title: LED emission device
- (2) JP Pat. Appln. Discl. No. 2000-31547 - Jan. 28, 2000
Patent Application No. 10-193508 - July 9, 1998
Priority: None
Applicant: Stanley Denki K.K., Tokyo, Japan
Title: Sheet-type light source
- (3) JP Pat. Appln. Discl. No. 61-158606 - July 18, 1986
Patent Application No. 59-276804 - Dec. 28, 1984
Priority: None
Applicant: K.K. Koito Seisakusho, Tokyo, Japan
Title: Lighting apparatus